

REMARKS

The courtesies extended to applicant's representative during the interview on August 9, 2007, are acknowledged with appreciation.

In the Office Action of May 22, 2007, the Examiner objected to claim 1 and rejected claim 23 for informalities which have been corrected with this response.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-11 and 21 as being obvious over Brady in view of Nemir et al. The Examiner stated that Brady disclosed a plug (tubular body 18) passing through an aperture of a pad member (inflatable cuff 60). The Examiner indicated that Brady did not disclose a plug removably secured to the pad. The Examiner relied upon Nemir for disclosing a removable pad and stated that it would have been obvious to combine this teaching with Nemir et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed and was discussed during the interview.


The cuff 60 is inflated through a lumen 65 extending within the tubular body 18. It is not possible to have a cuff which is both inflatable and removable from the tubular body. Nemir discloses a similar arrangement wherein the balloon 22 is inflated to a lumen 26 connected to a valve 24, allowing the inflation and deflation of the balloon 22. As the pad of Brady is an inflatable cuff, it is not possible to make this cuff removable, as is recited in the claims.

Dependent claim 8 recites that the device further includes an inflatable cuff encircling the plug. In the statement of rejection of claim 8, the Examiner states that Brady discloses an inflatable cuff. While this is true, the inflatable cuff is used in the rejection of claim 1 to meet the limitation of a pad member. Therefore, the inflatable cuff 60 is used to meet the dual limitations of a pad member and an inflatable cuff when rejecting claim 8. Claim 23 recites that the first and second conductors

each comprise a first section extending from a circuit board to the aperture and a ring extending about the aperture. This claim was not rejected on art and it is assumed that the claim is allowable with the amendment to overcome the rejection under \$112, second paragraph.

If any issues remain and the Examiner believes a telephone conversation would resolve such issues, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,


Christopher J. McDonald
Reg. 41,533

August 9, 2007

HOFFMAN, WASSON & GITLER, PC
2461 South Clark Street
Suite 522
Arlington, VA 22202
703.415.0100
cmcdonald@hwglaw.com

Attorney's Docket: A-8601.AMB/cjm/cat